



THE PRASNOTTARA:

(BEING QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON TOPICS OF INTEREST TO THEOSOPHISTS.)

Issued by the Indian Section of the Theosophical Society for free distribution to Members. Members of Branches will receive copies through their officers. The Theosophical Society is not responsible for any statements contained herein.

Any Member can send questions, answers to questions, opinions and notes upon Theosophical subjects or matters relating to Hindu Religion, Philosophy and Customs, and is requested to do so. When necessary, communications will be condensed by the Editor.

Write on one side of the paper only and address all communications to the Editor:—BERTRAM KEIGHTLEY, Gen. Sec., Adyar, Madras.

For paragraphs under the word "Ans." the Editor is personally responsible.
June, 1891.

QUESTION XIX.

In the Puranas it is said that Rishis cursed persons to become beasts, &c. for some definite time. This appears contrary to evolution. How can it be explained?

D.M.O.—In this question there are two things which attract our attention. First, whether the turning of human beings into beasts, birds, or other inanimate things by the curses of *Rishis*, *Munis* and others was ever possible: and second, if so how can it be reconciled with the evolution theory. As regards the former it remains to be said that such instances are so many and met with so frequently in mythological and religious writings of all nations and of all countries, that one cannot discredit these statements, unless they can be proved false. In these days of *Kali Yuga*, when *Rishis* and *Munis* are so rarely to be met with, and when things material have an upper hand

over things spiritual, the idea that human beings possessed such extraordinary powers will be wholly discarded. But even in these days one who has any opportunity to observe such people may find instances of abnormal powers. Persons who possessed them were able enough to control the occult laws of nature, and, with the help of such laws, they were in a position to do anything they liked. They not only used these powers whenever their anger was aroused, but they equally used them to the benefit of any one who was able to get into their favour. Curses were pronounced very often by some *Rishis*, among whom Durvasas is notorious. But it was in very rare cases that such a heavy penalty as to turn a human being into an animal or inanimate thing was imposed. There is, therefore, no sound reason why those ancient books should not be relied upon.

Now there remains the latter portion to receive our consideration. The tenets of the evolution theory would not allow of such a change as the *Rishis* are believed to have effected. But these tenets have no consideration for the occult side of nature, which generally manifests its extraordinary powers through the spiritual portion of beings. It is therefore necessary that one should take into account the powers which all human beings possess in embryo, and which had been highly developed in those *Rishis*, &c. These powers were so potent in their effects that those who possessed them were feared even by *devas* or *gods*, who at times became victims of their displeasure. Thus it will be perceived that nothing was impossible to those who had developed their inner powers to such an abnormal extent. They were masters of elements, and could rule over them. With such powers at their command there was nothing impossible; and the changes mentioned in the question under notice were easily effected by them. These changes were nothing else but putting stop to the working of a particular law of nature, which they could do in an instant merely by their highly developed *will-power*.

It is also said that the victims of such a displeasure remained under their altered condition for a particular period. This can be explained in two ways. Sometimes the person laid under such a curse did not suffer the change instantaneously, and so he had an opportunity to get himself pardoned so as to receive his *anugraha*. In such instances a period was prescribed after which the victim was to regain his original condition. At other times when there was no such opportunity and the change was instantaneous, the effect being in fact of the force of the *will-power*, was sure to exhaust at a particular time and after such time he was to regain his former state. In any way there was nothing more in the change than simply stopping that particular law of nature which pushed the ego or individuality on; and there is nothing in it which will be found in conflict with the evolution theory, if the hidden powers in man are once granted and taken into account.

P.B.N.—The curse of Rishis in such cases referred, is to mind, and not to body. A man cannot become a beast or stone, but his moral senses and the action of Higher Manas could be suspended by the strong will of the cursing Rishi.

E.D.—The plain texts of the Puranas goes to show that Rishis and others cursed people only in very rare instances. In such cases the change intended by the curser could not only be felt by the injured party, but also perceived by all people. A curse naturally began, "I *desire* that you should become such and such a thing, for such and such an offence, and you should remain in that condition for so many years until you are done such and such an act by such and such a person." This shows that not only an arrest of development was intended, but the change in view was actually worked out.

I.C.D.—When people are capable of assuming any shape at will or by means of some drugs, even in the present day, it is not very strange that Rishis could change by force of the will or by some other way the physical bodies of culprits and encase them there for a certain length of time. I do not recollect reading of any case in the Puranas where it is

stated that human beings so forced to inhabit animal or mineral bodies had to pass through all the intermediate stages of evolution in order to regain human shape. We read in the Ramayana that Ahalya was turned into a stone; but by the touch of Rama's feet, she at once regained her human shape and consciousness. A temporary loss of consciousness is not, in my opinion, contrary to the laws of evolution for a mere blow on the head can make one senseless; his memory may be gone and he may have no appearance of life; scientists would be the last persons to call this contrary to evolutionary laws.

There are various aspects of this question, but I shall deal only with the most remarkable. In our Puranas we see Rishis cursing people to become in the words of the Puranas "stones, beasts, &c., for a certain time and then recover their original state through the intervention of some other person or on the happening of some event." Taken literally it would go against the doctrine of eternal progression that says, "nature shuts all her gates when one has passed through them," thereby meaning that an ego cannot (except in the case of persons who have attained the immortality of evil) return to a lower form of life after it has once passed it. A plant cannot be a stone, an animal, a plant; and a human being an animal. But in the case of these curses there is this explanation. We see that a strong mesmeriser so controls his subject as to make him think as the mesmeriser likes. The mesmeriser tells him he is a dog and forthwith the subject begins to act like one. Then, why cannot a Rishi by the potency of his will, so control and influence the thoughts and feelings of a subject as to make him think that he is an ass or any other beast or even a stone or tree for the time being. But there remains the question of form. The person cursed not only thinks himself a beast or a tree but even others see it so. How is that to be accounted for? We see Hindu jugglers perform feats of Maya called in Sanskrit *Indrajala* and *Mahendrajala*. They make a certain thing or scene to be observed and experienced by a large number of persons; whereas it is the mental image projected and impressed by the will of the

actor on the minds of the spectators. Why cannot a Rishi, *i. e.*, an adept, so produce a *Māya* as to make it last for a required period of time? It is only a question of the power of will. He can make others see what he likes. In some curses we hear of the subjects retaining their *Purvajanma Smarana*, *i. e.*, consciousness of their previous state of life. Here it is only a question of change of form and not the control of the subject's will.

QUESTION XX.

Is one relieved of the effects of bad karma by Prayaschittam, i. e., penance?

D.W.—Penance appears to be a measure more preventive than reparative or corrective. A man repents or is penitent after sinning, and this expression of sorrow and suffering for his past action, must be prophylactic rather than curative. A truly repentant offender would take care to avoid repeating the offence, but that does not count as reparation for the mischief done, nor could we take it for a safeguard against perpetration of deeds other than the preceding if animalism be dominant in the individual.

N.S.R.—Bad karma may be classed under two heads; with reference to its results as affecting principally the individual who forms the karma, or another person directly injured thereby. Selfish *thoughts* and vicious *desires* affect mainly the person indulging therein; robbery or murder injures directly the person robbed or murdered. If the law of karma requires that justice shall be done to the *injured man*, it follows that no amount of penance can repair the wrong done to him, or in other words enable the wrong-doer to avoid making compensation for the wrong. Penance properly performed, *i. e.*, genuine repentance, is beneficial only in so far as it checks the tendency to the repetition of the evil thoughts and acts, in expiation of which it is performed. For it is well known that every such act or thought leads one to a fresh act or thought of a like character. It can be no satisfaction to the wronged individual that the wrong-doer has become a reformed man; and the

effects of the bad karma cannot be exhausted until the wronged man is compensated. The popular notion that one can rid himself thoroughly of the consequences of bad karma by Prayaschittam is well satirised in the proverb, "Kill a cow and make a gift to the Brahman of shoes made from the leather of the slaughtered animal."

The answer to the question proposed, is that one is only partially relieved of the effects of bad karma, by the performance of Prayaschittam.

C.K.M.—A cause must necessarily have its effects. Therefore, however sincere the repentance, and however severe the penance, a man is never relieved of the effects of bad karma once created by him. He must reap the consequences of his own acts. For karma is the unerring law which adjusts effect to cause tracing cause back to its producer; it is "that law of re-adjustment which ever tends to restore disturbed equilibrium in the physical, and broken harmony in the moral world." J. H. Conelly, F.T.S., makes the following explanation on this point:—"In this faith there is no such thing as pardoning, or 'blotting out of evil or wickedness already done,' otherwise than by the adequate punishment therefor of the wrong-doer and the restoration of the harmony in the universe that has been disturbed by his wrongful act. The evil has been his own and while other must suffer its consequences, atonement can be made by nobody but himself." A crime once committed is past recall—for the results of his evil deeds continue to exist; the suffering caused to others by his wickedness is not blotted out. Therefore how can he by Prayaschittam or penance expect to be relieved of the effects of bad karma once committed, for his actions have already disturbed the harmony of the universe, and it must be re-adjusted. So he must undergo the effects of the bad karma, either in this life or in the life to come.

To say that Prayaschittam or penance is of no consequence in relieving one of the effects of bad karma, would be inadequate. For, as Emerson has it, "every action has a tendency to repeat itself" and so it has, for even in our doings in everyday-life we

find instances of this tendency. The ego, when once it has created a bad karma, is tempted often to repeat the same, and so creating fresh bad karma. By Prayaschittam we can prevent the ego from doing that. So penance, though it cannot relieve us from the effects of the primary bad karma, can prevent the commission of endless bad karmas of like nature. Mrs. Sinnett has the following lines about it:—"Repentance, if sincere, will deter a man from repeating errors; it cannot save him or others from the effects of those already produced, which unerringly overtake him either in this life or in the next re-birth."

J.R.—No, never. No amount of penance, repentance, ascetism, or alms-giving nor bathing in Ganges or pilgrimage to a sacred place would exonerate you from the bad Karmas committed by you by premeditation and intention; but those committed accidentally without your intention, will not affect you provided you tried your best to avoid them, if they were unavoidably committed, and you sincerely repented and still repent and avoid them. But there is another benefit by the penance—"that you improve your mind for further avoidance of those bad Karmas—strengthen your will to do better in future, and thus lighten the effects of previous bad Karmas. In the same way you cannot escape from the effects of your previous Karmas or the influences of heavenly bodies as some would assure you that you can do by alms-giving, or sacrificing certain quantities of wheat, sugar, rice, ghee, &c., on behalf of the sun, moon, Venus, Saturn, &c. You can understand very well that you cannot change their courses in the heavens and alter their astral effects on the universe, but by your meditation by certain Mantras or earning their good effects and by making such sacrifices you lighten their injurious influences. In my humble opinion penance is beneficial only in an indirect manner. It won't relieve you directly from your bad Karma.

E.D.—Before answering this question, we have to enumerate the different kinds of sins for which penance is prescribed in the Hindu Shastras—(1) *Gnānakrit*, those which were commit-

ted with a full knowledge of the results ; (2) *Agnánakrit*, those which were committed unconsciously. Either of these is again divided into (a) *Kámakrit*, those which were committed with intent, or desire, and (b) *Akámakrit*, those which were committed without intent or desire. Madhavacharya, among other writers, takes for example, the case of a cow standing near a man. If he pelts a stone at her knowing she would die, then the action is said to be *gnánakrit* ; it is *kámakrit*, or *akámakrit* when he does so knowing it would die, but with, or without any intent or desire that it should die. On the other hand, if he pelts a stone at the cow not knowing that she is there, the sin is said to be *agnánakrit*. Some writers argue that this class of sins is either *kámakrit* or *akámakrit*, when he does so without caring to know whether there is a cow or not ; or when he committed the sin not knowing that there was a cow.

In the case of grave sins, such as killing a cow, penance is inadmissible when the sin is *gnánakrit*, and at the same time *kámakrit* ; while all the other kinds of grave sins, have some penance or other, the performance of which washes the sin off. The minor sins have, of course, each a penance, varying as to their degree of criminality.

QUESTION I.—(Resumed).

In what precise way is Meditation to be practised by a Theosophist ?

J.R.—In our Hindu Shastras the first “Ashrama” (Stage of life) of man is “Brahmacharya” in which he is to learn and practice Dharma and Upasana. That is, in that “Ashrama” he is to learn and become what a man ought to, viz. what his duties are (a) towards himself, (b) to his status of life in this world, (c) to his relatives, superiors and inferiors, (d) to other mankind, (e) to God, &c., and to discharge those duties with as much perfection as possible. In other words he is to learn how he should deserve the name of that creature called man. To become a perfect man is the aim of Brahmacharya and how to attain that aim is taught in the sacred books of all nations, and creeds, namely, by imitating the Divine man—described as “Saguna.” The more a man imitates those Divine qualities, the nearer he approached

to perfection and due right to be called a man, and without those qualities he does not deserve to be called a man. Now to observe this in all his actions, is in my humble opinion the precise way in which meditation is to be practiced by a "Theosophist."

QUESTION XIV.—(*Resumed*).

Is the ascetic life obligatory or essential for all men?

S.C.S.—The question is rather meagre. What is meant by "ascetic life," at what stage is it to be adopted—from the very beginning of one's life, or at a certain stage of it, is not made clear? It need not be said that it is not advisable for "all men" to become ascetics all their lives. How it is objectionable is patent. Neither is ascetic life even during only a portion of one's life, possible for all men or desirable.

Manu says, "When he has paid his three debts (to the sages, the manes, and the gods) let him apply his mind to final beatitude; but woe shall befall one who presumes to seek beatitude without having discharged those debts. After he has read the vedas in the form prescribed by law, has legally begotten a son, and performed sacrifice to the best of his power, he (has paid his debts and) may then apply his heart to eternal bliss—(Manu VI. 35 and 36.)

Again, "when the father of a family, perceives his muscles become flaccid and his hair grey, and sees the child let him then seek refuge in a forest." (VI—2.)

"But if (a Brahman) have not read the Veda, if he have not begotten a son, and if he have not performed sacrifices, yet shall aim at final beatitude, he shall sink to a piece of degradation." (VI—37.)

Says Col. Olcott in his foot-note, page 2, Golden Rules of Buddhism—"The history of all monastic establishments shows that there are persons temperamentally unfit for celibate life and not sexually self-masterful." He also quotes St. Paul, "It is better to marry than to burn."

There is no use of a man's becoming an ascetic unless and until he is fit to be one. A man of subdued passions and

desires, learned and wise, and knowing the supreme soul, is an ascetic of course. He whose heart is full of earthly desires, who is a slave of his passions and without Divine knowledge, let him not aspire to be an ascetic, be he young or old, learned or otherwise.

It is, however, not indispensable that a man must marry and must enter the Grahasta Ashrama before becoming a Sanyasi: he who is under competent self-control may become a Sanyasi even from the second order, i.e., Brahmacharya or from the first even—(Kulluka's commentary on Manu, Chap. VI. 38).

It therefore seems that not only is ascetic life neither obligatory nor essential for all men, but is also unprofitable and impossible one.

QUESTION XVII.—(Resumed).

What class of Karma determines whether a Jiva shall be born in a male or a female body?

C.R.S.—According to the Secret Doctrine, the early races were bi-sexual as is shown in the legend of Ardhanariswara (Siva and Parvati in one body). Down to the end of the second race the only sex difference was in the mental plane. Minor physical differences were produced later on, by the mental peculiarities seeking by pressure on the physical body, expression in the material plane. As the two began to develop these sets of qualities, a change took place in the physical envelope also. Organs that were unused became atrophied and disappeared; new organs began to develop by exercise. This was the separation of the sexes and it reached its limit when man became an eating animal. An ego before quitting this plane of existence has to exhaust all its various sorts of experience. So a man after he has acquired in himself all the male attributes, longing after anything or grieving when he is disappointed and who knows that Devachan is but Maya and his own creation, has no Devachan and is born again in a comparatively short period of time. As to the question whether this has any bearing on this earth life, I can only say that it is impercepti-

bly small and that it lies in the other way. But when we see the Devachanic and Kamalokic periods dwindle away rapidly, we may be sure that the births of that ego upon this earth will be very few and short as all that remains to be exhausted is the past Karma.

K.P.M.—The particular class of Karma that determines a male or a female body has hitherto been kept a profound secret; we can approach the question in an indirect way and thus try to find out the answer. Why are we reborn at all after death? The Shastras say on account of our *Asakti* or physical attachment and our *Karma Bandhanam* or the bondage of Karma. Now what is the main characteristic of a female as distinguished from a male? The answer is that women are generally emotional, while men are more fitted for abstract ideas and the exercise of their reason and judgment. Mother-nature is ever bounteous, she always tries to provide the Jiva with what it wants. We really make our surroundings from birth to birth, and we are born male or female either as we wanted in the previous birth, or as we cultivated our emotional nature, or our stronger faculties.

A.N.S.—This, like every thing else relating to the future, must find its solution in the nature of the Karma, generated by a living individual. The body being but the vehicle in which the acquired Karma of an individual can best be worked out, it is plain therefore that the distinction of male and female exists in the higher planes of nature than the body. Calling all these higher planes, the mental, there must therefore be such a fact as being a female or a male mentally. What then is the difference between man and woman on the mental plane? It may be indicated by the terms, "abstract and concrete," "Adam and his rib," "whole and the part," &c.

In Indian works, the wife is called *Saha-Dharmini*, or she who contributes towards the carrying out of Dharma and shares in its fruits. The male plans out the Dharma and the female works it out. *Purusha* guides and *Prakriti* obeys. The man works and earns for the household, and the wife

arranges the house and pleases the husband, who derives from the pleasure, the impulse to further action. The wife is therefore the motor or sakti of the house. The man loses himself in metaphysics, and the wife will understand a part of it and beautifully work it out in a novel. The man and woman being viewed together, the woman is the individualizing spirit and thus goes to extremes. She errs in her vanity, errs in her cruelty, errs in her extravagance, and errs in her parsimony. In Mahabharata, Darmaputra answers the question "who is cruel," by saying a woman. As an observer of European society, partially, I will answer the question "who is vain," by saying the woman. As an observer of Hindu society, I will answer the question "who is parsimonious," by saying the woman.

To conclude, I can say that all men who cultivate the spirit of vanity, who narrow the broad bond of sympathy, who will not look truth boldly in the face, who will go to a certain extent and no further, are contracting what may be called the female tendencies, or are already making themselves females to whom the proper material vehicles will be provided when time comes. Conversely all females who shirk off the faults of the sex, and serve the cause of Purusha, will become males.

I.C.D.—If originally Jiva was bi-sexual and subsequently differentiated into sexes, perfectionment of the several functions and spiritual faculties will not be possible if the Jiva does not undergo experiences in both the bodies. A close observation will show that the masculine and feminine qualities are complementary to each other; and as the development of one set of qualities will but make the Jiva half perfect, that of the other half becomes a necessity, so that the Jiva may have both the wings to enter into the sexless state of being. I may here observe that the feminine signs on the breast of the males are to me almost sure indications that he was one day a female. In a true Yogi the feminine and the masculine qualities are beautifully harmonized. As for the nature of the Karma which determines bodies, an inordinate prevalence of the masculine qualities would make a man liable to wear in his next incarna-

tion a female body; such persons in their last days become womanish, and often think of wives and children.

QUESTION XVIII.—(*Resumed*).

Is belief in elementals a superstition? If not, are they self-conscious? Are they intelligent, and if so, what is the character of their intelligence? How are they defined and described in the Shastras?

P.B.N.—Belief in elementals is not a superstition. These are semi-intelligent forces of nature. They are both good and bad. Man can have mastery over them by practising certain processes laid down in Tantric books. It is generally the bad class that is easily attracted towards man. In that case it has continually to be pointed out or given work which must be bad and selfish and which will therefore degrade the master of the elemental. If the master fails to do this, the elemental will turn upon him. In the Shastras they are described under the names of Baitál, Dakini, Yogini, &c.

C.R.S.—Among the Hindus the name Pisacha is indiscriminately applied to the spirits that obsess persons. These are the best known of the elemental class, as the phenomena produced by them are more ordinarily visible. They are of two classes—Pretas, *i.e.*, the astral remains of dead persons, and the real elementals. The former are driven away by satisfying their wants, but the real elementals are obstinate and are forced to quit the person only by incantations and magical ceremonies. The elementals go by various names in Sanskrit—Dakini, Sakim, Koosmánda, Mohini, Bhuta, &c., and in Tamil—Veeran, Kátteri, Játa-muni, Sáttán, Karuppan, Irulan, Pidári, Mâdan, and many others whose names are legion. They possess no such self-consciousness as the human beings do, but they have a peculiar instinct that makes them satisfy their impulses by seeking those whose natures are congenial and over whose astral nature they can have control. They are semi-intelligent, and hence very easily taken in and controlled by clever sorcerers. Not being limited by the physical bonds of the body they know many things that we do not, and this accounts for the supposed wonderful intelli-

gence displayed by them in telling many things that are beyond the reach of the man of five senses. In the Shastras they are described as beings having no definite form, but manifesting themselves to men in frightful appearances as described in the Tantras. They belong to and live in any one of the five elements. They are strongly affected by sound, especially by a rhythmical modulation of it and by certain diagrams and letters. They can be brought under control by these means and made to serve the ends of the person. They are blind mechanical engineers of terrible power in the hands of the sorcerers. They delight in blood and congregate, where it is shed. They take advantage of the moral weaknesses in human nature that open for them a gate as it were into the astral nature of a man; and having no physical body and longing for one, live upon the vital energy of the person, until he is drained completely. Again, there are spirits that guard where treasures are buried and frighten away all persons until they are satisfied by certain sacrifices being offered them. The elementals, as a whole, are afraid of light, sharp iron instruments, red chillies, incense, assafoetida, and holy things. They frequent burial places, burning grounds, battle-fields, the banyan, the asvattha, *Ficus religiosa*, the tamarind and some other trees, but avoid the margosa. The leaves of the margosa are used as a protective against them, and in houses where there is small-pox; and during a delivery these leaves are placed in the front to ward off the evil influences.

K.N.I.—The Hindu Shastras divide elementals into two classes—the Devaganams and Asuraganams or the good and bad ones. The good pertain to the Suvar loka or state of matter, and the bad to Bhuvvar loka. A belief in their existence prevails throughout India. But the only question is whether they are intelligent ones superior to man in creation; or semi-intelligent automatic forces in the subtle world of matter, which obey certain laws, and which every man has to conquer. The Shastras do not give a direct answer to the question; but should we go through all the authorities, we shall find that the latter is the case for the following reasons:—

Firstly. The Upanishads clearly say that the propitiation of Devas, &c., as a man's goal, leads him to a deplorable state; and that even if they be meditated upon as a manifestation of Brahm, as every atom of matter is, it is only a circuitous path called Vāmadeva path. Chapter IV of Maitrayani Upanishad deals with this subject. Mundaka Upanishad (I Mundaka, II Khanda, 5 to 10) goes further and says that persons who wish to have the embrace of Devas in the Deva world are only fools like the blind led by the blind, being subject to repeated births. Here I would say that because devas are said to be a manifestation of Brahm, people jump to the conclusion that they are superior to men. But they forget that according to the Advaita theory even an atom of matter in the universe has its consciousness and that there are different degrees of consciousness in this world.

Secondly. The Vishnu and other Puranas state that man is evolved only after Devas, plants and animals are evolved, showing thereby that man is a perfected being. Besides, all the Vedas and Puranas state that there is an eternal warfare going on between the Devas and Asuras each trying to get ascendancy over the other, but when the Asuras get the ascendancy, Vishnu has to come for the rescue of the former implying thereby that Asuras are more powerful than Devas. Does not all this imply that these are merely Dharma and Adharma preponderating in the world at different times as they do in the body of man?

Thirdly. There is the broad theory that each man progresses up through his own free will to the Universal Self, and thus attains salvation, whereas no such progress is predicated of the Devas or Asuras, nor do we hear of any Devas or Asuras having attained Mukti (or salvation). But they are stated in our books to live throughout the Manvantara at the end of which they are absorbed as every other natural force is.

Fourthly. The Bhagavat and other puranas in describing the body of man, say that Indra and other deities preside over his ten organs of sense and action, and incite him to action, and

that his body is only the body of Virāt Purusha in miniature. That is, the body of man magnified immensely, is only the gross body of the Universe. It is also known that each person in his upward spiritual path has to conquer his Indriyas or organs of sense and action. From this it follows that these Devas are only forces which each man has to conquer, he being the lord of creation. Moreover the 16th chapter of the Bhagavadgita says that through these Devas and Asuras, we get good and bad qualities.

The mistaken idea prevalent among some people in India of making them superior to men in intelligence, arose, I think, through the anthromorphic character given to them in the Vedas. But they forget the fact that they are merely personified to represent their intelligent movements on the higher plane. Thus they are inferior to men in creation. But that they have some sort of intelligence obeying certain laws is also clear from the Vedas themselves. How can automatic natural forces have any sort of intelligence, or semi-intelligence as it is called ! Here I would quote Sankara who in speaking of those things that are difficult of attainment, says in a couplet that there are three such, viz., getting salvation, seeing a mahatma and being born a man. If Devas are higher in intelligence than man, surely they would have found a place here. Lastly, many abnormal powers are displayed by men in India which cannot be accounted for except on the theory of elementals. Hence a belief in elementals is not a superstition but is rational.

NOTICE.

Q. 1, 3, and 4 on page 16 of Prasnotara No. 3 and others that are left unanswered in Prasnotaras Nos. 1, and 2, will be dealt with in the next and subsequent issues of Prasnotara.